



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,960	09/26/2003	Kourosh Gharachorloo	200302257-2	9440

7590 05/03/2007
HAWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHERY, MARDOCHEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2188

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/672,960	Applicant(s) GHARACHORLOO ET AL.	
	Examiner Mardochee Chery	Art Unit 2188	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 4-6, 11-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's communication filed on February 20, 2007 in response to PTO Office Action mailed on September 20, 2006. The Applicant's remarks and amendments to the claims and/or the specification were considered with the results that follow.

2. In response to the Office Action mailed on September 20, 2006, claims 1-7 and 11-21 remain pending.

3. The objection to claims 2, 5, and 10 has been withdrawn due to the amendment filed on September 26, 2003.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 11-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. The term "potentially" in claims 19 and 20 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "potentially" is not defined by the claim. The specification

Art Unit: 2188

does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

7. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "a plurality of nodes that potentially store cache copies" recited in claim 19, line 7, and claim 20, line 7, as broad and indefinite does not particularly and specifically point out the claimed subject matter.

2,

Double Patenting

8. Claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,919 contains every element of claim 1-7 and 11-21 of the instant application and as such provisionally anticipates claim 1-7 and 11-21 of the instant application.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " **ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC.**, United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

This is an obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach by Patterson Hennessey in view of McCracken (2002/0059500).

With respect to claim 1, Patterson and Hennessey teach a multiprocessor computer system [Fig. 8.22, pp 680]; comprising a plurality of nodes, each node including an interface to a local memory subsystem, a cache memory, and a directory. Patterson and Hennessey (pp 679-680, 682-683) also disclose a directory-based cache coherence protocol, along with a bit vector, wherein the vector includes bits for state information (shared, uncached, and exclusive), bits associated with the owner of the block, and a bit associated with each processor that has a copy of that corresponding memory block (i.e. the shares); a protocol engine implementing a cache coherence protocol configured to associate with each respective bit of the identification field one or

more nodes of the plurality of nodes determined by reference to the position of the respective bit within the identification field (pp 679, 681). Additionally, an invalidation request can be made to a specific number of nodes (the sharers) associated and predefined by the set bits in the bit vector (pp 683-685).

However, Patterson does not explicitly disclose the first predefined number of nodes being greater than one, but less than the number of nodes associated with set bits in the identification field.

McCracken discloses the first predefined number of nodes being greater than one, but less than the number of nodes associated with set bits in the identification field [par. 0018] to continue the operation of a node controller effectively without waiting for receipt of acknowledgment messages from processors that are not there (par. 0018).

Since the technology for implementing a multiprocessor system with the first predefined number of nodes being greater than one, but less than the number of nodes associated with set bits in the identification field was well known as evidenced by McCracken, an artisan would have been motivated to implement this feature in the system of Patterson to allow the operation of a node controller to continue effectively without waiting for receipt of acknowledgment messages from processors that are not there. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the system of Patterson to include the first predefined number of nodes being greater than one, but less than the number of nodes associated with set bits in the identification field since this would have allowed the operation of a

node controller to continue effectively without waiting for receipt of acknowledgment messages from processors that are not there (par. 0018) as taught by McCracken.

Regarding claims 2 and 4, Patterson and Hennessey teach node identifiers in the identification field having a plurality of bits (e.g. state field: shared, uncached, or exclusive) that identify a subset of the plurality of nodes. In the teachings of Patterson and Hennessey, the second predefined number of nodes could be interpreted as the total number of nodes or bits in the bit vector. Patterson and Hennessey also teach that the invalidation request is sent to the first subset, the "sharers" (pp 680-685), predefined by the setting of each bit to "1".

Regarding claim 5, Patterson and Hennessey teach the use of a bit vector (pp 680), including a plurality of bits associating each node with a bit ("second number"). A plurality of nodes with a bit set in the bit vector indicates the number of nodes sharing the memory block ("first number"). The second number could be greater than the first. In this instance, the protocol associates each respective node (whether it be the first, second, third...or the nth node) with a particular node identifier, corresponding to one of the bits in the bit vector.

Regarding claim 6, Patterson and Hennessey also teach a first node associated with the set bit receiving an invalidation request from the protocol (pp 680-685).

Regarding claim 16, Patterson and Hennessey disclose (pp 680-685) a respective subset of bits (e.g., bits used to either identify owner of the block or bits used to identify a state such as the exclusive state are able to associate one node within the subset of sharer nodes) configured to associate one node within the subset when the subset of nodes includes fewer than a second predefined number of nodes (e.g., total number of nodes or bits in the bit vector).

Regarding claim 17, Patterson and Hennessey also teach the use of bits to track the state of each cache block (e.g., pp 679-681).

Regarding claim 18, Patterson and Hennessey teach (pp 680-685) a respective subset of bits (e.g., bits used to either identify owner of the block or bits used to identify a state such as the exclusive state are able to associate one node within the subset of sharer nodes) configured to associate one node within the subset when the subset of nodes includes fewer than a second predefined number of nodes (e.g., total number of nodes or bits in the bit vector).

11. Claims 19-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safranek (US 6,493,809) in view of Yagi (6,564,302).

With respect to claims 19-21, Safranek teaches a protocol engine implementing a cache coherence protocol, for use in a multiprocessor system (e.g., Fig. 2), the protocol

engine located at a particular node of a plurality of nodes, the protocol engine (e.g., Fig. 4) comprising: input logic for receiving a first invalidation request (e.g., col. 8, ll 61 to col. 12) the invalidation request identifying a memory line of information and including a pattern of bits for identifying a subset of the plurality of nodes that potentially store cached copies of the identified memory line; and processing circuitry, responsive of receipt of the first invalidation request for sending a second invalidation corresponding to the first invalidation request to a next node if the plurality of bits in fact identifying the next node (e.g., col. 8, ll 61 to col. 12); sending an invalidation acknowledgment (e.g., a response) to a requesting node identified in the first invalidation message if the plurality of bits fail to identify a next node (e.g., response to indicate that it is complete; col. 8, ll 61 to col. 12); and invalidating a cached copy of the identified memory line, if any, in the particular node of the plurality of nodes in the multiprocessor system.

However, Safranek does not explicitly disclose the invalidation request including a pattern of bits for identifying a subset of the plurality of nodes that potentially store cached copies of the identified memory line.

Yagi discloses the invalidation request including a pattern of bits for identifying a subset of the plurality of nodes that potentially store cached copies of the identified memory line [col. 4, ll. 39-57; col. 8, ll. 39-52] to determine whether the data address to be accessed by the memory request is present in the cache (col. 4, ll 45-57).

Since the technology for implementing a multiprocessor system with the invalidation request including a pattern of bits for identifying a subset of the plurality of nodes that potentially store cached copies of the identified memory line was well known

as evidenced by Yagi, an artisan would have been motivated to implement this feature in the system of Safranek in to determine whether the data address to be accessed by the memory request is present in the cache. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the system of Safranek to include the invalidation request including a pattern of bits for identifying a subset of the plurality of nodes that potentially store cached copies of the identified memory line since this would have helped with determining whether the data address to be accessed by the memory request is present in the cache (col. 4, ll 45-57) as taught by Yagi.

12. Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach by Patterson and Hennessey in view of McCracken (2002/0059500) and further in view of Safranek (US 6,493,809).

Regarding claims 11 and 15, Patterson and Hennessey teach the limitations of claim 1, but do not specifically teach that the protocol includes in the initial invalidation request a pattern of bits such that the recipient node of the initial invalidation request can derive from the pattern of bits of a next recipient node, if any, to which to send a second invalidation request corresponding to the initial invalidation request. Safranek, however, teaches a method of invalidating shared cache lines by using a protocol, wherein the invalidate request is sent from the head node to a succeeding node (recipient node) on the sharing list and continuously in a doubly linked list format until

Art Unit: 2188

the last recipient node has recipient the request (e.g., col. 8, ll 61 to col. 12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Safranek with Patterson and Hennessey because Safranek provides a particular method that can be used to invalidate a request and specifically states that the method is "useful in multiprocessor systems such as a distributed shared memory (DSM) or non-uniform memory access (NUMA) machines that include a number of interconnected processor nodes each having local memory and caches that store copies of the same data " (Safranek; Abstract) and may be used with various types of protocols (e.g., Safranek: col. 12, ll 55-67), as described by Patterson and Hennessey. The combination of the two teachings would reduce the time for invalidating cache lines on a sharing list by performing some of the requisite actions in parallel.

13. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach by Patterson and Hennessey in view of McCracken (2002/0059500) and further in view of Laudon (US 5,634,110).

Regarding claim 12, Patterson and Hennessey discloses the limitations of claim 1, but do not specifically mention that the identification field is subdivided to form a number of groups of bits and to send an initial invalidation request to a first node, if any, associated with a set bit in the respective group of bits. Laudon, however, disclose a modified coarse bit vector format (e.g., col. 7, ll 30 to col. 8, ll 57), which includes an

identification field that is subdivided. An initial invalidation request would then be sent to a first node associated with a set bit along with a pattern of bits. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to combine the teachings of Patterson and Hennessey with Laudon because Laudon discloses particular types of bit vector formats that can be used for cache coherency in a distributed computing environment as described by Patterson and Hennessey. The combination of the teachings would provide for different vector bit types that results in minimal if any directory storage overhead.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, in the system of Patterson and Hennessey, the protocol send s the invalidation request to all the nodes with a set bit (pp 682-685). Thus, if the node of the second is set, an invalidation request will be sent to the second node.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 3 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

15. When responding to the office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty that he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art

Art Unit: 2188

disclosed by references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. See 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c).

16. When responding to the Office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out where support, with reference to page, line numbers, and figures, is found for any amendment made to the claims.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mardochee Chery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4246. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30A-5:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on (571) 272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

April 30, 2007


HYUNG SOUNG
PATENT EXAMINER

4-30-07



Mardochee Chery
Examiner
AU: 2188